



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,933	11/30/2000	Kyu Dong Kim	342310.0005	2877

7590 05/02/2003

John W. Ryan
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
2445 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1420

EXAMINER

IRSHADULLAH, M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/725,933

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

M. Irshadullah

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign-language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) Page 9, line 16: Please insert "a process manager" between "manager" and "and a folder" so as to maintain a consistency with Fig. 3;

- b) Page 14, end of line 17 to line 18: "a process monitor" is depicted in Fig. 5 as "Process Engine", please choose one in order to maintain a consistency between the specification and Fig. 5.

Appropriate corrections as mentioned above and others through out the specification are appreciably required for the benefit of the Patent Community.

Claim Objections

- 1A. Claims 19-43 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 18 is missing, hence claims 19-43 be renumbered as 18-42.

Appropriate correction is appreciably required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3623

3. Claims 1, 8-15, 25-33, 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (US Patent 5,548,506) in view of Tatham et al (US Patent 6,223,177 B1).

Srinivasan shows:

Claim 1. A workflow management system for automating a business process (Abstract, lines 1-4, wherein "designing and implementation of Auto Multi-project Server System" providing "automation of tasks of project management coordination for work-group team members" clearly infers that the reference system provides "a process of performing and controlling (managing the flow or workflow of) tasks" to be performed by the team members (work-group) of an organization, and wherein "organizational" infers that reference is concerned with a process relating to a business organization), comprising:

a) a host computer that controls the system (Abstract, lines 5-6 and col. 2, lines 59-61);

c) a process designer that creates and models the flows and properties of the business process (Srinivasan: Col. 7, lines 32-34, Fig. 2 (50) described col. 5, lines 53-54 recited with and Fig. 3, col. 5, lines 23-39, wherein "module 50" would be used for creating "project plan comprising information on the project, tasks, dependencies and resources (col.7, lines 32-34)", and thus functions as "a process designer" and "designing (Abstract, line 1)" and "compiling multi-project plans (Abstract, lines 9-10)" as well as "team leader's creating 'project plan'" infer "modeling" and Fig. 3 depicts the

claimed said project plans' flow and properties-See Applicant's Spec., page 6, lines 10-13 and page 21, line 11 through page 23, line 12);

d) a database that compiles information on the administrative steps and properties of the business process (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (10), col. 5, lines 23-25, Fig. 2 (60), col. 5, lines 62-63. Applicant will appreciate that cited databases would be used to store (compile) the application comprising steps to be used by the administrator (See discussion about administrator in 1b) below), also, said databases would be used to store (compile) above discussed "business process and properties");

e) a process engine that executes and handles the business process based on the information on the administrative steps and the flows and properties of the business process (Srinivasan: Fig. 2 (20 working in co-operation with 10, 30, 40, 60, 70, 80, 100 and 110) described col. 5, line 53 through col. 6, line 18. Here, cited "auto project management server software (col. 4, lines 29-32) functions as "a process engine", and see discussion about "administrator" below, and discussion about "business process" above); and

g) an application program that can be used for the business process (Srinivasan: Col. 1, lines 33-35 read with col. 5, lines 8-15. Cited software (application program) were being used for above discussed business process).

In the following element:

b) an administrator that prepares for automating the business process;

Srinivasan shows the following features:

preparing the business process for automating (Col. 7, lines 13-25 and col. 1, lines 33-50, wherein "organization" would constitute "department", "work-team" infers "members and user groups", "authorization information" indicates "authorities" and "project leaders" infer "role" {See Applicant's spec. page 17. lines 11-13 read with line 19 (using the administrator: a software program or module for administrator's use) and Applicant's "people" is considered as administrator} and as discussed above, the reference automates tasks of project management coordination (Abstract, lines 2-3), as also the reference system is concerned with a process related to a business organization). Furthermore, Srinivasan teaches a variety of system users (Col. 3, lines 21-22, col. 6, line 64 through col. 7, line 3 and col. 7, line 28); yet Srinivasan does not specifically show the following feature:

an administrator.

However, Tatham et al teach the same (Fig. 3e, col. 7, lines 53-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate Tatham et al's feature into Srinivasan's invention, thereby entailing a system with enhanced functionality and extended utility.

In the element below, Srinivasan does not show claimed feature:

f) a web client.

However, Tatham et al teach the same (Col. 3, lines 39-42).

~~It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of~~
instant invention to incorporate Tatham et al's feature into the combination of

Art Unit: 3623

Workgroup and Srinivasan's invention, thereby employing the latest available technology and thus providing a system with enhanced functionality and extended utility.

In the following claim Srinivasan does not show the claimed features:

Claim 8. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the web client further comprises:

However, Tatham et al teach the same a worklist handler (Fig. 1 (170). Reference's "template" would be used as the claimed worklist handler.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of instant invention to incorporate Tatham et al's feature into Srinivasan's invention, thereby employing the latest available technology and thus providing a system with enhanced functionality and extended utility.

a workitem handler (As discussed above), and

a process monitor (Tatham et al: Col. 5, lines 51-54 and motivation above).

Claim 9. The workflow management system of claim 8, wherein the worklist handler maintains a work list for a user (inherent, since it is the basic function of above discussed worklist handler).

Claim 10. The workflow management system of claim 9, wherein the workitem handler supports the business process execution (Inherent, since it is the requisite functionality of above discussed workitem handler).

Claim 11. The workflow management system of claim 10, wherein the process monitor checks the status of business process (Tatham et al: Col. 5, lines 51-54 recited with col. 1, lines 35-35 and motivation in Applicant's claim 8 above).

Claim 12. The workflow management system of claim 11, wherein the process monitor further check history of the business process and current business process (Tatham et al: Col. 5, lines 51-54 and col. 7, lines 7-8. Reference's "history" function would be used for claimed limitation and see motivation in Applicant's claim 8 above).

Claim 13. The workflow management system of claim 12, wherein the process monitor further monitors the resource utilization (Tatham et al: Col. 5, lines 51-54. Reference's "monitoring" function would be used for claimed purpose and motivation in Applicant's claim 8 above).

Claim 14. The workflow management system of claim 2, wherein the organization manager further creates, deletes and maintains relationships between the departments, ranks and information of the members in the department (See discussion

Art Unit: 3623

of claim 2a) above and Srinivasan's col. 7, lines 50-51. Reference's "ranking" function would be used for claimed purpose and motivation in Applicant's claim 8 above).

Claim 15. The workflow management system of claim 14, wherein the organization manager further registers the members' identification (See discussion of claim 2a) above and Srinivasan's col. 3, lines 36-38. Reference's "identification assigning" function would be used for claimed purpose and motivation in Applicant's claim 8 above).

Claim 25. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the process engine comprises:

a) an interface agent that can interchange with other process engines information on status of the business process (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (User A, User B, User C) and abstract, lines 7-9);

b) a request manager that receives requests from a user, directs the process engine to handle the requests, and returns results to the user (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (Users A, B, C communicating with 20 via 30, wherein reference's "messaging" function infers availability of a program to facilitate users' requesting (request manager) the system for project data or information and other claimed purposes);

c) a dispatcher that retrieves and executes the requests and stores results in the database (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (Users A, B, C communicating with 20 via 30) and bi-

directional arrows clearly indicate availability of program (dispatcher) facilitating “retrieval” and “execution” of users’ request);

d) a scheduler (Tatham et al: Col. 7, lines 14-18 and motivation in if) above);

e) a security manager that controls the certification process with the certification server outside (Srinivasan: Col. 3, lines 33-38, wherein citation of “security issues” infer system’s capability of providing claims security manager);

f) a database broker that interfaces with the process engine and the database (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (20 interacting (interfacing) with 10 via 40), col. 4, lines 26-33 and 36-38, wherein “network operating system” infers a program or module (broker) being used for facilitating communication between cited 20 and 10).

Claim 26. The workflow management system of claim 25, wherein the activities handled by the process engine comprise states of: initial; waiting; dead; running; suspended; complete; terminated; error; and overdue (Inherent, since claimed functional elements are an essential requisite of a software program (process engine), Fig.) (20) as discussed in Applicant’s claim 1e) above).

Claim 27. The workflow management system of claim 25, wherein the scheduler manages a deadline activity and a wait activity (See discussion of claim 25d) above and said scheduler would be used for claimed limitations).

Claim 28. The workflow management system of claim 25, wherein the security manager further encodes and decodes information (Srinivasan: Col. 3, lines 33-38. Reference's "security" function would be used for claimed purpose).

Claim 29. The workflow management system of claim 26, wherein the activities transits among the states according to a business rule (Inherent, since all tasks or activities have to follow some conditions (business rules) and would change position (states) as they would be acted upon by the system).

Claim 30. The workflow management system of claim 26, wherein the process engine controls the workflow using a transition count in order to keep a consistency of the business process transit (See discussion of claim 1e) above. Reference's AMPS, Fig. 1 (20) would be used for claimed purpose).

Claim 31. The workflow management system of claim 30, wherein the process engine sets to zero the transition counts of all the transitions that can be processed in a forward direction from an activity, when the activity is started (As discussed above, Srinivasan's AMPS would be used to perform claimed limitation).

Claim 32. The workflow management system of claim 31, wherein the process engine further sets to one the transition counts of all the transitions that may

Art Unit: 3623

stem from the activity, when the activity is completed (As discussed above Srinivasan's AMPS would be used for claimed purpose).

Claim 33. A method for automating a business process, comprising steps of:

a) modeling the business process (See discussion of Applicant's claim 1c) above);

b) designing the business process (See discussion of Applicant's claim 1c) above);

c) compiling the business process in a database (See discussion of Applicant's claim 1d) above); and

d) executing the business process (See discussion of Applicant's claim 1e) above); and

In the following element Srinivasan does not explicitly show the claimed feature:

e) monitoring the business process.

However, Tatham et al teach the same (Col. 5, lines 50-51). Reference's system relates to a business activity or process (Col. 5, line 55), cited "monitoring" function would be used for checking (monitoring) said business activity (process)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of Applicant's invention to include Tatham et al's feature into Srinivasan's invention, thereby achieving a system with extended functionality and enhanced utility.

Claim 36. The method claim 33, wherein the step of designing a process further comprises:

identifying an activity to be executed (Srinivasan: Claim 1b), wherein "identifying" function would be used for claimed limitation); and

allocating a property on the activity (See discussion of claim 34c) above).

Claim 37. The method of claim 36, wherein the activity comprises: a start activity that starts a process; a normal activity that involves an intervention by a participant; a wait activity; a mail activity; a SQL activity that accesses an application database; a sub-process activity that comprises a plurality of separate activities; an agent activity that automatically activates a program; a connector activity; and an end activity that represents an end of the process (Inherent, since claimed functions or elements are an essential requisite of a program or process or activity).

Claim 38. The method of claim 36, wherein the property comprises:

- a) a participant that describes an individual that executes the activity (Srinivasan: Col. 6, line 67, wherein "assigning" function would be used for claimed purpose);
- b) an application (Srinivasan: Col. 1, lines 33-35);
- c) a post-condition that determines when the activity is completed (Inherent, since some conditional function have to be programmed for ascertaining (determining) as to when a process (activity) would be considered done (completed));

d) a schedule that describes planning of the activity (Srinivasan: Col. 1, lines 51-53 and col. 7, lines 32-33);

e) a deadline (Srinivasan: Col. 3, lines 23-24);

f) a sub-process that describes a location and an option of the sub-process' activity (Inherent, since a software program inherently comprises steps (processes) and each process (step) would be a sub-step or subprocess) and the same details (describes) the requisite information including claimed option, location);

g) a parameter that defines a value necessary for executing a program in the agent activity ((Srinivasan: Col. 3, lines 18-25, wherein "priorities", infer some kind of parameter to used for claimed purpose);

h) a mail-to that determines the recipient of e-mail in the mail activity (Inherent, since it is requisite information in a mail or email procedure or application);

i) a mail content that represent the contents of e-mail in the mail activity (Inherent, since it is requisite information in a mail or email procedure or application);

j) a general information that shows the names and the descriptions of the activity (Srinivasan: Claim 2 read with col. 7, lines 24-25 and col. 3, lines 1-5);

k) a transition condition that represents conditions for an input transition and an output transition (Inherent; since, it is the basic function of any logical function or condition); and

l) an icon (Tatham et al: Fig. 1 (Site #1 through 7 being symbolic representation of sites for users 30, 40 etc., are indeed "icons").

Claim 39. The method of claim 36, wherein the participant can comprise one of or any combination of a user, a department and the role (Srinivasan: Abstract, lines 1-3, col. 4, lines 42-44, wherein "organization" infers comprising constituent entities including department, division, section etc., and "work group" indicate users and "program managers, team leaders" etc. infer claimed role).

Claim 40. The method of claim 39, wherein the participant can be a manager of the participant (Srinivasan: Col. 3, lines 21-22, wherein "general or program manager" infer claimed authority).

Claim 41. The method of claim 39, wherein the participant can be a peer of the participant (Srinivasan: Col. 7, line 2, wherein "task leaders" would be claimed entity (peer of participant)).

Claim 42. The method of claim 39, wherein the participant can be a department of the participant (Srinivasan: Abstract, line 3, wherein "organization" infers provision of some entity or entities such as claimed department).

Claim 43. The method of claim 39, wherein activity is allocated based on the workload of the participant (Inherent, since tasks or activities are assigned in accordance with working capabilities (workload) of workers (participant)).

4. Claims 2-7, 16-24 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (US Patent 5,548,506) in view of Tatham et al (US Patent 6,223,177 B1) and further in view of Workgroup automation tools for end users (Software Review) (Office IQ), hereinafter "Workgroup".

Claim 2. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the administrator further comprises:

In the undernoted element:

a) an organization manager that can create, delete and maintain a department;

Srinivasan shows:

an organization manager (Fig. 1 (60), col. 4, line 43 recited with col. 3, lines 21-22, wherein program (general) manager functions as organization manager and "an organization (Col. 1, line 38) would encompass various entities, such as "department" which would be controlled (maintained) by said general (program) manager; yet

Srinivasan does not show the features below:

create, delete

However, Tatham et al teach the same (Col. 2, line 3 and col. 5, lines 39-40. Applicant will appreciate that cited functions would be used for claimed purpose).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of current invention to incorporate Tatham et al's feature into Srinivasan's invention, thereby providing a system with enhanced functionality and extended utility.

b) a role/group manager that can create, delete and maintain a role and a user-group (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (60), col. 6, line 64 through col. 7, line 3, wherein cited

“program manager, project leader, tasks leaders” infer availability of claimed “role/group manager” and see discussion about create, delete etc. above);

c) an authority manager (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (60) and col. 3, lines 21-22 and col. 7, line 28, wherein “general or group or systems” manager points to claimed “authority manager” that can create, delete and maintain authorities to access the business process and the application program and can allocate the authorities to the role, the group and the organization member (Col. 7, lines 22-25. Reference’s “authorization” function would be used for claimed purpose);

In the following element, both Srinivasan and Tatham et al do not show the claimed feature:

d) a folder manager that can create, delete and maintain a folder;

However, Workgroup teaches the same (Page 1, lines 5 and 24-26 read with page 2, lines 53-54, wherein citation of “documents, folders” infer availability of a “program” to manage various documents, folders etc. (folder manager)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of current invention to incorporate Workgroup’s feature into the combination of Srinivasan and Tatham et al’s invention, thereby providing a system with extended functionality and enhanced utility.

Claim 3. The workflow management system of claim 2, further comprising an object manager, wherein the object manager interfaces the administrator with the

database (Workgroup: Page 2, lines 12-13, wherein "storage in object-oriented" format infers the availability of claimed "object manager" and since system provides "sharing information", coordinating activities" etc. and "networks", the same would be used to provide claimed interface. See motivation in 2a) above).

Claim 4. The workflow management system of claim 3, wherein the database further comprises:

an organization database (Srinivasan: Fig. 1 (60) and reference's "project database" Fig. 2 (60), the same would be used for claimed purpose);
authority database (Fig. 2 (60) and Fig. 1 (60), cited database 60 would be used as storing information about group managers, team leaders etc. which function as authority) and

a folder database (Srinivasan's database, Fig 2 (60) would be used as claimed one).

Claim 5. The workflow management system of claim 1, wherein the process designer comprises:

a) a graphic designer that can create and design an activity and a business process using a graphic interface (Workgroup: Page 2, lines 1-11 and motivation in 2a) above); and

b) a property designer that can define an activity to be executed in the business process (Srinivasan: Fig. 3, col. 5, lines 23-39, wherein Fig. 3 entries clearly infer

availability of a program that facilitate claimed defining, execution etc. and motivation in 2a) above).

Claim 6. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the processor designer further comprises an object manager that interfaces the processor designer with the database (Inherent, since Srinivasan's various system components communicate with each other, said communication interface would be used for claimed purpose).

Claim 7. The workflow management system of claim 6, wherein the 43 database comprises:

- a) a process definition folder that contains information related to the business process modeling (Inherent, since provision of a function for defining a process is a fundamental requisite of any program or system and said function is stored in a storage means (database) in some form or format including a file or folder etc.);
- b) a data folder that contains data generated by the business process s execution (Inherent, since provision of some partition in a database for storing data in some format (file or folder) is an essential requisite in database building); and
- c) an organization folder (As discussed above).

Claim 16. The workflow management system of claim 2, wherein the 15 role/group manager can further allocate the member to the role and the user group (See

discussion of claim 2b) above and Srinivasan's col. 6, line 67 and col. 4, lines 15-16.
Reference's "assigning" function would be used for claimed limitation).

Claim 17. The workflow management system of claim 2, wherein the authority manager can allocate the authorities to the role, the group and the organization member (See discussion of claims 2c and 16 above).

Claim 19. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the property designer can allocate the activity to a participant (See discussion of claims 5b and 16 above).

Claim 20. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the property designer can set up a business rule (See discussion of claims 5b and Srinivasan's col. 3, lines 21-25).

Claim 21. The workflow management system of claim 20, wherein the business rule includes terms, conditions and a transition path after completing the activity (Srinivasan: Col. 5, lines 21-25, wherein "priorities" for completion, "task deadlines" and "resource usage" infer claimed terms, conditions etc.).

Claim 22. The workflow management system of claim 5, wherein the

process designer further comprises a check-out table (See discussion of claim 1c) and Srinivasan's Fig. 3, col. 5, lines 24-25, wherein Fig. 3 file would be used as claimed table).

Claim 23. The workflow management system of claim 22, wherein the check-out table contains information on a process model currently checked-out by a user (Srinivasan: Fig. 3, col. 5, lines 24-25, wherein Fig. 3 file would comprise the claimed feature).

Claim 24. The workflow management system of claim 23, wherein the system keep a currently checked-out process from being checked-out again by referring to the check-out table (As discussed above, Fig. 3 file would be used as claimed checkout table which would be used for claimed limitation).

Claim 34. The method of claim 33, wherein the step of modeling the business process further comprises:

a) generating an organization chart (See discussion of claim 2a, and Workgroup's page 1, lines 36-38, wherein "templates" would be used to create (generate) claimed chart);

b) creating a role (See discussion of claim 2b) above); and

c) allocating an authority to the role ((See discussion of claim 2c) above).

Claim 35. The method of claim 33, wherein the step of modeling the business process further comprises:
generating an organization chart (See discussion of claim 34a) above);
creating a group of human resources (See discussion of claim 34b) above); and
allocating an authority to the group of human resources (See discussion of claim 34c) above).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Bernardo et al., US Patent 6,308,188 B1. System And Method For Building A Web Site With Automated Workflow.

B) Gibson et al., US Patent 6,006,193. Computer Executable Workflow Control System.

C) Chaman et al., US patent 5,255,181. Method For Planning Organizational Activities.

D) Mann et al., US Patent 5,216,592. System And method For Business Process Automation.

E) Barr et al., US Patent 5,182,705. Computer System And Method For Work Management.

F) Schumacher, US Patent 4,942,527. Computerized Management System.

Art Unit: 3623

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Irshadullah whose telephone number is (703) 308-6683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 11:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



M. Irshadullah
April 17, 2003



TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600